

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

ALFRED A. JOHNSON, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANNETTE CHAMBERS-SMITH, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-CV-432

Judge Michael R. Barrett

**OPINION & ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) filed by the Magistrate Judge on August 20, 2023, (Doc. 8), as well as the supplemental R&R filed by the Magistrate Judge on September 1, 2023, (Doc. 14). Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice to Plaintiff Alfred A. Johnson, Sr., that he could forfeit review or rights on appeal if he failed to file objections in a timely manner. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).<sup>1</sup> No objections to either R&R have been filed, and the time to do so has expired.

Accordingly, the R&R, (Doc. 8), and supplemental R&R, (Doc. 14), are hereby **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in full. Consistent with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge:

- I. Johnson’s motion to supplement, (Doc. 13), is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part;

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Johnson did send a letter to the Court that could be construed as expressing an intention to object, he failed to actually do so in the ample time afforded to him.

- i. The motion is **GRANTED** to the extent that Johnson seeks to amend his complaint with related claims;
- ii. The motion is **DENIED** to the extent that Johnson presents evidence or caselaw ostensibly in support of his position or seeks to renew or supplement his requests for injunctive relief and a writ of mandamus;
- II. Johnson's claims concerning the loss of personal property and related issues are **DISMISSED** for failure to state a claim;
- III. Johnson's unrelated claims against additional defendants and unrelated sexual harassment claims are **SEVERED** and **DISMISSED** without prejudice; and
- IV. Johnson's motion for injunctive relief, (Doc. 6), and motion for a writ of mandamus, (Doc. 7), are **DENIED** as moot.

Further, the Court **CERTIFIES** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore **DENIES** leave to appeal in forma pauperis. See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a); *Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Michael R. Barrett  
Michael R. Barrett  
United States District Judge